

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/544,108	04/06/2000	Kenneth Eliot Sherman	<u>-</u>	7634	
7	590 04/04/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
CAROLINE NASH			BOESEN, A	BOESEN, AGNIESZKA	
NASH & TITUS, LLC			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
21402 UNISON ROAD			AKTONII	PAPER NUMBER	
MIDDLEBURG, VA 20177			1648		
			DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/544,108	SHERMAN, KENNETH ELIOT
Examiner	Art Unit
Agnieszka Boesen	1648

	Agnieszka Boesen	1648					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>04 January 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) \square The period for reply expires $\underline{4}$ months from the mailing date							
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In vent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. miner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN DIMONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
xtensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee ave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, hay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). IOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>04 January 2006</u> . A bit the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any replacements.	or any extension thereof (37 CFR 4	1.37(e)), to avoid dis	missal of the				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief,	, will <u>not</u> be entered b	ecause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		TE below);					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		ducina as almalificina	the issues for				
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for						
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the				
For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3-8,10-17 and 19-24</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	nd sufficient reasons why the affiday	vit or other evidence i	s necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.							
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application is	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
			noe booddo.				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 13. Other:							
·							

Continuation of Item 8. The after-final amendment filed January 4, 2006, will not be entered because of the declaration filed under 37 CFR 1.132 by Kenneth Sherman. It is noted Examiner Timothy Brown indicated that a declaration can be used to overcome the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. The claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph in the Office action of January 13, 2005 for the same reasons. The declaration presents evidence that would minimally require further consideration. Entry of the instant amendment is denied. The filing of an RCE would permit entry of this amendment.

Agnieszka Boesen March 29, 2006

Stacy B. Chen
Patent Examiner